

VZCZCXYZ0001
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHNR #0328/01 0410934
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 100933Z FEB 10
FM AMEMBASSY NAIROBI
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 0795
RUEHC/USAID WASHDC 0009
INFO RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHINGTON DC
RUEATRS/DEPT OF TREASURY WASHINGTON DC
RUEHAN/AMEMBASSY ANTANANARIVO 0001
RUEHC/DEPT OF AGRICULTURE WASHINGTON DC
RUEHDR/AMEMBASSY DAR ES SALAAM 0044
RUEHDS/AMEMBASSY ADDIS ABABA 0031
RUEHKH/AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM
RUEHKI/AMEMBASSY KINSHASA
RUEHKM/AMEMBASSY KAMPALA
RUEHLG/AMEMBASSY LILONGWE
RUEHLGB/AMEMBASSY KIGALI 0010
RUEHLS/AMEMBASSY LUSAKA 0001
RUEHLU/AMEMBASSY LUANDA 0001
RUEHNR/AMEMBASSY NAIROBI
RUEHSA/AMEMBASSY PRETORIA 0034
RUEHTO/AMEMBASSY MAPUTO 0001
RUEHWD/AMEMBASSY WINDHOEK

UNCLAS NAIROBI 000328

SIPDIS
STATE FOR C MARISA PLOWDEN AND F ROBERTA CAVITT
USAID FOR AFR/SD JEFF HILL, TOM HOBGOOD, MCURTIS, AND ELOKEN, DCHA/PPM SBRA
DLEY, EGEA MYATES, AND COO JKUNEN AND GMARICLE
STATE PASS USTR
STATE PASS PEACE CORPS
STATE PASS MCC
STATE PASS USADF

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [ECON](#) [EAGR](#) [EAID](#) [ETRD](#) [KGHG](#) [SENV](#) [ENRG](#) [PREL](#) [KE](#)

SUBJECT: KENYA: SUMMARY OF REGIONAL CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP ON GHFSI
AND GCC

INTRODUCTION

1. USAID/East Africa hosted a Whole of Government workshop in Nairobi, Kenya February 1-5, 2010 on the implementation in eastern and southern Africa of the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI), as well as on the planning of investments related to global climate change (GCC). Over 120 people active in these two areas from six U.S. Government agencies -- State, USAID, USDA, USTR, MCC, the Peace Corps, and the US African Development Foundation (USADF) -- attended the workshop. Participants came from Washington and from the ten missions active in the GHFSI -- East Africa and Southern Africa regional, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique -- as well as from the missions in Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, Angola, and Namibia. There was good representation from the country and regional teams, including economic, commercial, environmental, and agricultural officers from the embassies, as well as management, program, and technical officers from USAID.

2. The Mission Directors from East Africa, Ethiopia, Sudan, and Tanzania, and the Deputy Directors from Kenya, Mozambique, and Southern Africa participated, particularly on the final day. They expressed support for both initiatives, and provided practical suggestions on how to expedite implementation. The Regional

Director for Africa of F, the Office of Foreign Assistance, participated in a number of the sessions.

GHFSI Outcomes

13. Mutual understanding of recent developments in the USG strategy for the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative, including the five core principles guiding the initiative: 1) comprehensive plan; 2) country-led and owned; 3).strategic coordination; 4) multilateral cooperation; and 5) sustained commitment. The meeting was a valuable opportunity for the USG professionals responsible for implementation in the field to discuss issues with key representatives of the inter-agency team from Washington.

14. The three days of meetings on the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative produced the following outcomes:

-- Sharing of experiences among agencies and missions on how the Whole of Government approach can best contribute to African

country-led and regional strategies and investment plans oriented around the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP), supported by national governments and multiple donors. There were presentations on how multilateral organizations and funding mechanisms complement USG-supported programs.

-- Sharing of experiences from country teams on their progress putting Whole of Government principles into operation at the field level.

-- Clarification of the steps to be taken by the missions in 2010 to put in place a new architecture for the implementation of effective programming of significantly expanded activities to meet the major objectives of the GHFSI. These are: 1) Improved economic performance of the agricultural sector, 2) Improved nutritional status, and 3) Improved capacity of vulnerable households to meet their food needs.

-- Presentations and discussions on the planning and implementation of programming in key component areas. These were: 1) Vulnerability, reaching the ultra-poor and linking development with humanitarian assistance; 2) Nutrition; 3) Gender mainstreaming; 4) Transport corridors and regionally integrated markets; 5) Building capacity in public and private institutions; and 6) NRM, climate change, and food security.

-- Discussion in small groups of opportunities for joint planning and potentially coordinated procurement in program areas common across country teams. Points of Contact for each group will follow up with plans for further consultations and designs. The areas were: 1) Capacity building; 2) Reaching the very poor; 3) Nutrition, 4) Seed and fertilizer supply chains, 5) Livestock and pro-pastoralism programs; and 6) natural resource management and climate change.

-- Second drafts of the Implementation Plans (IPs) for all of the participating Missions for FY 2010, as well as the Diplomatic Strategies of each mission were discussed in side meetings. The final IPs, due March 1, will include summaries of the Diplomatic Strategies.

-- Of the eight focus countries represented at the meeting, two - Rwanda and Ethiopia - have already signed a CAADP country compact, and Rwanda has had its Investment Plan endorsed by a technical review team organized by the AU/NEPAD. A report on the high-level meeting held in Rwanda in December, 2009 provided a concrete example of the factors and processes involved. USAID and other members of the country teams have taken responsibility to work with the agricultural donor groups in the six additional countries, as well as on regional compacts in the COMESA and SADC regions, to move the process forward. The key steps are: 1) the development of a sector-wide strategy based on stock-taking and evidence drawn

from analysis; 2) the signing of a CAADP compact by relevant ministries and development partners, establishing their commitments to the strategy; 3) the development of an investment plan and policy action plan based on that strategy; and 4) a technical review of those plans, leading immediately to implementation. The AU and NEPAD will be distributing guidelines for post-compact investment planning and review to help guide that process. By the end of FY 2010, it is expected that six additional in east and southern Africa countries and one of the Regional Economic Communities will have reached at least stage two, the signing of a compact.

-- A draft Results Framework for the Initiative was presented and draft indicators against which expanding activities will be monitored were shared. Participants were encouraged to provide comments and feedback by March 15.

-- Proposed methods for impact assessment were discussed, as well as the Mutual Accountability Framework being developed for all of the partners linked to CAADP.

-- Identification and discussion of key management issues of staffing, procurement, technical support, etc. that will need to be resolved in each mission in 2010 as the GHFSI and programs in climate change are scaled up. USAID Mission Directors, program officers, and Acquisition and Assistance officers from Washington and from the region participated actively in these discussions, to find solutions.

GCC Outcomes

15. The two-days of meetings on Global Climate Change produced the following outcomes:

-- Mutual understanding of how the U.S. Government is moving forward in the context of the Copenhagen Accord with programs in support of low-carbon economic growth and adaptation to the probable effects of climate change.

-- Preliminary agreement on how programs in the field should be planned and implemented.

-- Agreement on a recommendation to build strong regional programs capable of implementing key regional priorities, and of providing

technical support to bilateral missions in close consultation with Washington.

-- Agreement that Whole of Government country teams in Africa will be fully involved in shaping the development of the climate change program.

-- Discussion of the need to balance the integration of climate change programs into the GHFSI and other portfolios of the missions in Africa on the one hand, and the needs of Washington-based offices to track progress of narrowly targeted policy priorities on the other.

Workshop sessions on GHFSI

16. Representatives of offices in Washington provided an overview of recent developments. The GHFSI is a global, multi-agency USG effort, led by an inter-agency team chaired by the Counselor and Chief of Staff to the Secretary of State. USAID is taking a lead role in implementation, working closely with the OMB, the Treasury, USDA, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, (MCC) the office of the Trade Representative (USTR), and others in a coordinated, Whole of Government approach. Africa is in the spotlight because the chronically poor and hungry constitute a larger proportion of the population than in any other region of the world, and because in spite of national economic growth, the proportion of the population classified as poor has been increasing in many countries in recent years. The Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative, which may be branded "Feed the Future," incorporates the objectives and principles laid out at the G8 summit at L'Aquila, Italy and the Food Security Summit in 2009. An updated version of the strategy document was distributed. A draft results framework was presented and draft indicators were distributed for discussion and feed-back.

17. Presentations on the UN High Level Task Force on Food Security and on multi-donor trust funds managed by the World Bank provided the context within which the USG initiative is working as part of broader multi-lateral efforts. The CGIAR system of international agricultural research centers has mobilized multilateral support for many years. The centers have long-term presence in many countries, and have built the capacity of national systems to generate applied research, policy options, and technology dissemination through partnerships. A lunchtime talk by a woman African scientist supported by the AWARD program provided concrete examples of the benefits.

18. African governments, in partnership with the private sector, civil society, and the international donor community, have taken a leadership role through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP). Africa-wide, thirteen countries have

completed CAADP Country Compacts, which are endorsements by governments and development partners of evidence-based sector-wide strategies. After these are signed, the next step is to work towards comprehensive plans for investment and policy reform that will be externally reviewed by a team of experts mobilized by the AU and NEPAD. An additional seven to eight countries and at least two regional economic communities (RECs) are expected to sign Compacts by the end of this fiscal year. CAADP is a country-led, not an exclusively government-led process. The process must include effective consultations with private sector and civil society organizations, as well as with the agricultural donor groups. A policy reform agenda is a key element in every strategy. USAID and other members of the country teams have taken responsibility to work with the agricultural donor groups to advance the CAADP process as the keystone partnership for the GHFSI in Africa. A presentation of the process in Rwanda, which is furthest along, provided a framework for discussion on how to adapt the process to circumstances in each country. In discussion, it was pointed out that national policies that affect the predictability of commodity prices and the stability of market conditions have a critical impact on farmers' incentives to invest to increase production for markets. Good governance more generally is an important component of effective programs with public institutions. The countries and sub-regions where hunger and food security are the most serious often have problems of policy and governance as well. The country strategies must deal with these issues.

¶9. In Washington, the Whole of Government approach has brought together State, Treasury, Agriculture (USDA), Trade (USTR), the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and other agencies with USAID to develop the GHFSI. The draft Implementation Plans developed by each of the USAID missions in the target countries have been reviewed by the interagency teams. In addition, the country teams led by State have submitted Diplomatic Strategies tied to the Initiative. These lay the foundation for the Whole of Government process in the field, identify key areas for policy reform, and name country and regional forums for disseminating information. Presentations by representatives the MCC, USTR, and USDA, as well as one sent from Treasury, explained how their programs can contribute, and provided information on how country teams can best link with their programs and resources. Representatives from each country team summarized their progress, and the DCM for Kenya expressed strong support for the integrated approach. The Peace Corps and the USADF also participated in the meeting. The final IPs, due March 1, will incorporate the technical programs, updated Whole of Government linkages, and the diplomatic strategies.

¶10. A key objective of the GHFSI in 2010 is to lay evidence-based foundations for further scaling up in 2011 and beyond. The core objectives of the initiative are 1) Improved economic performance of the agricultural sector, 2) Improved nutritional status, and 3) Improved capacity of vulnerable households to meet their food needs. Linked to these are a number of other key topic areas. Presentations and working groups discussed how country teams can best address these issues, and how they can work together to assemble relevant analysis, plan and perhaps also to jointly

implement certain activities. Among the issues discussed were the following:

-- Reaching the poor and vulnerable: linking humanitarian assistance with agriculture-based growth;

-- Regional integration and transport corridors, to increase regional trade and the availability of staple foods through improved access to markets for producers and reduced transactions costs;

-- Building integrated, cross-sectoral programs in nutrition, to set standards of accountability for measurable decreases in the prevalence of underweight children and to support country-led processes to reduce under-nutrition;

-- Incorporating women and youth into development processes;

-- Integrating natural resource management and adaptation to the effects of climate change into programs linked to the GHFSI;

-- Building programs in support of livestock productivity and trade, with as focus on mobile pastoral production systems in the extensive semi-arid regions too dry for other kinds of agriculture, increasing the resilience of very poor people and reducing conflict; and

-- Coordinated capacity-building, to provide short-term training to African partners in public and private institutions to strengthen their capabilities to contribute to programs and objectives of CAADP.

Management Issues

¶11. Within USAID in particular, key management issues of staffing, procurement, technical support, etc. will need to be resolved in each mission in 2010 as the GHFSI and programs in climate change are scaled up. All of the missions urgently need more people, including qualified and experienced professional staff. In addition, "surge teams" of experts available from Washington and the regional missions must be expanded to assist in program designs, reviews, evaluations, etc. Ways must be found to deal

effectively with very real constraints including National Security Decision Directive 38 (NSDD-38) ceilings on staff, office space, housing, support budgets, ICASS charges, and lengthy administrative approval processes. Concern was expressed about onerous reporting requirements. It was recommended that the GHFSI indicators and reporting requirements, as well as the definitions of funding categories, should be integrated with existing mechanisms as much as possible. Participants called for more certain budget levels in out years, to facilitate multi-year programming. The Mission Directors and other senior staff participated actively in these discussions, and expressed agreement on the need to work together to find solutions.

¶12. Led by members of USAID's Office of Acquisition and Assistance from Washington and the region, the group discussed flexible ways of setting up grants and contracts to scale up activities. The field is receiving mixed signals. On the one hand, the OMB recently issued a paper calling for reductions in costs and risks to the government, reducing reliance on IQCs, and encouraging smaller implementing agreements with increased participation by small businesses and African partners. On the other, the missions and country teams are being encouraged to find mechanisms to reduce the number and complexity of procurement mechanisms and management units. New requirements for Congressional notification for proposed procurements above specified thresholds are in the FY2010

Appropriations Bill. There is a strong need for a general waiver for the GHFSI in 2010. A&A offices both in Washington and in the field are over-stretched already. A&A specialists should be brought into the early stages of planning, so that programs can be scaled up quickly and effectively, using appropriate mechanisms within the framework of agency and administration policies.

¶13. The U.S. Government interagency team met with representatives from nongovernmental organizations, trade associations, and development agencies. This included local and international organizations resident and working in Kenya and East Africa. The consultation provided an opportunity to update the group on the consultation process, to document and review the principles underlying the initiative and describe the planning for implementation that is taking place. The meeting participants were appreciative of the consultations the U.S. Government has supported. They raised questions regarding the place of youth in the framework, as well as the need to fully recognize producer and community organizations as strategic partners. They encouraged the U.S. Government to support integrated programs that do not stovepipe programming for each initiative or program area.

Workshop sessions on Climate Change

¶14. USAID/East Africa hosted U.S. Government staff from missions across Southern and Eastern Africa and offices in Washington to plan for scaling up USAID's climate change investments. The two

days included discussions on how USAID is organizing to address climate change, an update on outcomes from the UN negotiations in Copenhagen in December that will impact USG policy and programs, and emerging analysis on opportunities for USAID climate change investments in Africa. Several USAID missions shared their experience in addressing climate change issues through existing investments in biodiversity, clean energy, and disaster response and readiness.

¶15. In Copenhagen, the U.S. committed to spending \$1 billion on REDD+ (UN Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries) - related activities over the next three years. In addition, the U.S. will contribute its share of an international commitment to spending \$10 billion per year on climate change over the next three years, rising to \$100 billion per year by 2020. Lastly, pending legislation in Congress is likely to shape the direction of the USG's climate change investments. USAID is still determining Copenhagen's impact on priorities, programs, and reporting on investments.

¶16. In meetings with AFR/SD and EGAT, each mission provided updates on national policy development on climate change and discussed potential USAID investment areas and technical assistance needs. Missions also provided input to emerging priorities. Although there were some areas where the data did not reflect the current situation, many missions felt that the analysis did provide a sound basis on which to lay out budget priorities.

¶17. Missions identified the need for strong regional climate change programs to provide technical support to bilateral missions and which are themselves supported by Washington. Missions also expressed that they want the field to be more involved in shaping

the development of the climate change program. Participants felt that there was a disconnect between Washington's expectation that climate change funds meet narrowly targeted policy priorities and field missions' emphasis on integrated programming that meets key development priorities, including climate change. Further clarification was requested on whether the USG can support GCC programs in countries that have not yet signed the Copenhagen Accord. Lastly, missions identified the need to clarify how to address the impacts of climate change on global food security as well as the broader climate change agenda that includes both low carbon development and adaptation to climate change across a range of sectors.

118. Questions and issues from all participants were collected throughout both sessions of the workshop. Many of these were discussed in the meetings, and other will be addressed through the interactive website: Food Security, Sustainable Trade, and Environmental Resilience (FOSTER) (<http://communities.usaidallnet.gov/foster>).
RANNEBERGER